



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/901,985	07/10/2001	Shigeo Sakaba	JP920000225US1	7943
36491	7590	12/23/2004	EXAMINER	
KUNZLER & ASSOCIATES 8 EAST BROADWAY SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111			HUYNH, KIM T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2112	
DATE MAILED: 12/23/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application N .

09/901,985

Applicant(s)

SAKABA ET AL.

Examiner

Kim T. Huynh

Art Unit

2112

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the corresponding address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 September 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 13-18 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4,5,8 and 10-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2,3,6,7 and 9 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 July 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1,4-5, 8, 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saegusa (US Patent 6,038,681) in view of Ofer et al. (US Patent 5,829,048)

As per claims 1, 5, 8, Saegusa discloses a computer system in which a plurality of host computers and a plurality of other devices are interconnected by SCSI (Small Computer System Interface), comprising:

A plurality of host computers (fig.1, 2,3) and one or more other devices interconnected by SCSI wherein one of said host computers has a device ID identical to a device ID of one of said other devices; and (col.1, lines 57-61)

Saegusa discloses all the limitations as above except inputting a reset signal to a SCSI control bus reset input of said one of said other devices in response to a terminal power of said one of said host computers being active. However, Ofer discloses the storage controller reset system for responding to the reset signal from one host and sending a signal to the other host indicating that the one host has sent a reset signal. Once host sends a reset signal which forces disk drives connected to the storage controller to a defined preset

initialization, each other host having access to the reset device for receiving the information. (col.1, line 62-col.2, line 10)

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skills in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Ofer's teaching into Saegusa's system so as to provide multi-storage system independently connected to the host computer by separate communications buses. (col.1, lines 5-8)

As per claims 4, 10, Saegusa discloses wherein said other devices comprise hard disk drives. (fig.1, 21-22)

As per claims 11, Saegusa discloses the method further comprising said one of said other devices disengaging from the bus interface upon receiving the reset signal. (col.4, lines 1-21)

As per claim 12, Saegusa discloses wherein the device is selected from the list consisting of hard-disk drives, CD\_ROM drives, WORM drives, and Bernoulli Drives. (col.4, lines 48-53)

### **CLAIMS OBJECTION**

3. Claims 2-3, 6-7, 9 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Prior art does not teach or suggest wherein said reset signal inputting means comprises an AND gate receiving at least said terminal power of said one of said host computers, and an OR gate having a first input receiving the output of said AND gate, and a second input receiving a reset signal of a SCSI bus.

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

4. Claims 13-18 are allowable.

Applicant's claimed invention is deemed allowable over the prior art of record as the prior art fails to teach or suggest a conflict resolution module configured to provide a reset signal to the device having a second device ID upon receiving notice of a conflict between the first device ID and the second device ID and after determining that the first host computer is receiving power from the host power terminal in combination with other limitations as recited in independent claims and further in view of the specification and applicant's arguments.

#### ***Response to Amendment***

5. Applicant's amendment filed on 9/10/04 have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### ***Conclusion***

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

7. *Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kim Huynh whose telephone number is (571)272-3635 or via e-mail addressed to [kim.huynh3@uspto.gov]. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00AM- 6:00PM.*

*If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Rinehart can be reached on (571)272-3632 or via e-mail addressed to [mark.rinehart@uspto.gov]. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)872-9306 for regular communications and After Final communications.*

*Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571)272-2100.*

Kim Huynh

Dec. 11, 2004



**TIM VO**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**